



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART III.—1. *Biblical Researches in Palestine, and in the Adjacent Regions. A Journal of Travels by E. Robinson and E. Smith.* In three volumes. Vols. I. and II. *Journal in 1838.* Vol. III. *Later Researches in 1852.* Drawn up from the Original Diaries, with Historical Illustrations, by EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D. With new Maps and Plans. Boston: Crocker and Brewster. 1856.

2. *Sinai and Palestine in Connection with their History.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, M. A., Canon of Canterbury. With Maps and Plans. London: John Murray. New York: J. S. Redfield. 1856.

3. *Phoenicia.* By JOHN KENRICK, M. A. London: B. Fellowes.

4. *Karte von Syrien und Palästina. Zu RITTER's Erdkunde,* von CARL ZIMMERMANN. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

5. *Reise nach Ostindien über Palästina und Egypten von Juli, 1844, bis April, 1853.* Von K. GRAUL. Leipzig. 1854.

6. *DR. TITUS TOBLER's Zwei Bücher Topographie von Jerusalem und seinen Umgebungen.* Berlin: Georg Reimer.

7. *Five Years in Damascus.* By Rev. J. L. PORTER, A. M., F.R. S. L. In two volumes. London: John Murray. 1855.

8. *Palestine. Description Géographique, Historique, et Archéologique.* Par S. MUNK. Paris: Firmin Didot Frères.

9. *Cartes de la Terre-Sainte: Atlas Universel.* Par HOUZÉ. Paris.

10. *The Chronological Scripture Atlas.* London: Bagster and Sons.

11. *Map of Jerusalem and its Environs.* By J. T. BARCLAY and SONS. Philadelphia: James Challer.

12. *Neue Hand-Atlas üb. alle Theile der Erde.* Berlin: H. Kiepert.

13. *Geognostische Karte des peträischen Arabien.* Wien: Joseph Russegger.

MAPS are an essential auxiliary to the study of history. The difference between correctly rendering Xenophon's narrative of the Expedition of Cyrus and rightly conceiving of that marvel of strategy, the catabasis of the Ten Thousand, is the differ-

ence between measuring off parasangs of unknown wastes and interminable marshes, and making a journey over a diversified and exciting region in the company of an intelligent and observing traveller, who remarks all the features and incidents of the way, while he notes carefully its times and distances ;—in other words, the difference between a lesson in grammar and a study in history. Almost every student of the classics will remember with what pleasure he awoke to the idea that the confused mass of names in Xenophon's *Anabasis* and Cæsar's *Commentaries*, which so stumbled in his undisciplined larynx, had each a locality upon the map of the world, and represented places as real as the Exeter, the Andover, the Ellington, or the New Haven of his grammar school. Almost every student of the Scriptures will remember a kindred satisfaction at the discovery that the geographical lists of the Book of Joshua had reference to the same Palestine that he now traces upon the map of Syria. The harbor in which a Russian fleet so cruelly massacred a Turkish convoy lying at anchor, was the same Sinope where Xenophon and his retreating army first made port in their coasting voyage down the Euxine. The Scutari where the allied armies had their hospital, was the Chrysopolis of that weary army, returning from defeat and disaster in the East. The Mount Tabor that witnessed the bloody triumphs of Napoleon and of Saladin, is the same from which Deborah and Barak descended to fight against Sisera. The St. Jean d'Acre which the Crusaders held against the Turk, is the Aecho of the Phœnicians whose inhabitants Asher could not drive out.* The almost fabulous marches of Xerxes toward the West, and of Alexander toward the East, become definite routes of travel when traced upon a map lettered with both ancient and modern names. The great empires of antiquity, that move like shadows over half the globe, assume shape and substance upon a well-defined chart. The travels of Herodotus are less a myth in the imaginary biography of Wheeler,† overlying his accurate geography of the Father of History,

* Judges i. 31.

† *Life and Travels of Herodotus*, by J. Talboys Wheeler, F. R. G. S. New York: Harper and Brothers.

than in the Clio, Euterpe, Melpomene, Urania, of the historian himself.

But while geography thus serves to locate and identify history, it also furnishes materials for history by its own progress as a science. A comparison of maps at different eras affords most striking proofs of the advancement of the human race in the knowledge of its own abode. The circular Thracia and Libya of Homer, girdled by the ocean, and fringed with Cimmerii, \mathbb{A} ethiopes, and Pygmæi; the more flattened sphere of Herodotus, divided into the two equal segments of Europa and Asia; the egg-shaped world of Strabo, in which Asia preponderates over both Europa and Libya, and upon whose surface appear the Northern and the Indian Oceans with their respective islands of Britannia and Taprobane; the trapezium-world of Ptolemy, with its well-proportioned Europa, Asia, and Africa, its Britain and its India, its seas, bays, mountains, rivers, and that vast inland Indian Ocean encircled by imaginary coasts of Africa and Asia,—the map which settled the geography of the world till Vasco de Gama entered the Indian Ocean by circumnavigating Africa, and Columbus pushed forth in quest of India beyond the Atlantic;—these mark the gradual construction of a science of the earth's surface from an utter blank, as legibly as geological strata mark the structure of the globe itself from chaos. By a series of maps constructed after Homer, Herodotus, Strabo, and Ptolemy, we trace the progress of navigation, of astronomy, of commerce, of travel, of conquest, of empire; while from the actual map of Ptolemy to Mercator's projection, we have the whole progress of the world from the second to the nineteenth century.

These general remarks are strikingly illustrated in the geography of Palestine and Arabia Petræa. Could we transfer to our pages the curious series of maps of the Holy Land collected by Laborde,* and add to them his own and those of Kiepert after Robinson, we should address to the eye a conception of the improved geography of Palestine, which we fear no description of ours can convey to the mind of the

* *Commentaire Géographique sur l'Exode et les Nombres*, par Léon de Laborde. Paris et Leipzig.

reader. Here, for instance, is a map of Arabia Petræa, with part of Palestine, and of Egypt from Jerusalem to Cairo, drawn after nature, in 1484, by Erhard Rewich, a painter of Utrecht, companion of the traveller Breydenbach. Jerusalem and Cairo appear in the foreground, nearly upon a line ; there is hardly any perceptible angle or turn at the junction of the coast of Egypt with that of Syria ; the Nile has three mouths, one emptying very near Alexandria ; while on the coast of Syria, besides the Rhinocolura, appears the mouth of a large river at Ascalon, and another at Jamnia. The Red Sea has two short square forks, and Mount Sinai, instead of lying between these, appears to the north of them both, and north-east of Cairo. This chart, however, is rather a geographical panorama than a topographical map. Again, we have a map of the same region, with the addition of the route of the Israelites, painted at the beginning of the fifteenth century on the walls of the cathedral of Hereford by Richard Haldingham. This is covered with hieroglyphics, and with figures of birds and animals, illustrating the natural history of each district. Lot's wife appears in a nude figure of melancholy mien, to mark the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah. The Red Sea is unmistakably red, looking like the scarlet pantaloons of a French recruit, with legs of unequal length. A broad track of white through the hither fork, like a plaid on the pantaloons aforesaid, marks the passage of the Israelites. Altogether this is a curious specimen of the geography and the art of the Middle Age. Besides these quaint specimens of cartography, Laborde's work contains maps of Arabia Petræa by Pococke in 1730, by Niebuhr in 1763, by D'Anville in 1764, by the French Commission in 1802, by Burckhardt in 1816, by Ehrenberg in 1824, by Rüppell in 1826, and by Colonel Lupie in 1828, as well as that of the author in 1841. It is curious to observe how the contour of the coast varies in these several maps, and especially how the southern extremity of the peninsula ranges on the scale of longitude from a mere point to a breadth of one and a half degrees. Now this whole region is accurately defined, and we have not only geographical, but geological, maps of Arabia Petræa, that are creditable both to science and to art.

For this improved knowledge of the geography of Palestine we are mainly indebted to the laborious and accurate research and observation of Dr. Edward Robinson. The results of Dr. Robinson's first visit to Palestine have been before the world for fifteen years, and have received the approbation of the most competent critics in England, Germany, and the United States. It were a very inadequate view of these results to regard them as the notes of a traveller, however acute in observing and patient in recording. They were strictly what the title of the volumes describes them to be,—*Biblical Researches* in Palestine,—the laborious and continued searching for places mentioned in the Bible, with the Bible itself as the authoritative guide. Strictly speaking, Dr. Robinson made few discoveries. Unlike M. de Saulcy,—who was bent upon regarding Palestine as some vast Nimrood mound, which he should first open to the admiration of mankind, and who succeeded in making “capital discoveries” under the very eyes of such competent explorers as Rev. Wm. M. Thomson of Sidon, and Rev. J. L. Porter of Damascus, in their respective beats of travel,—our more impassible countryman addressed himself mainly to the work of investigation, leaving nothing to chance, and pursuing nothing from impulse.

The visit of Dr. Robinson to Palestine in 1838 had been preceded by nearly twenty years of special preparation for the exploration of that land, with a view to a systematic work on its physical and historical geography. Dr. Robinson's edition of Calmet, familiar to all Biblical students, and the earlier volumes of the *Biblical Repository* edited by him, show for how many years his mind was engrossed with the details of Biblical geography before he had the opportunity of visiting the Holy Land. At the same time, his studies in Hebrew lexicography, and in the cognate Arabic, prepared him for those linguistic inquiries and comparisons which proved of so much value in his researches. Thus Dr. Robinson went to Palestine with a thorough and accurate knowledge of the geography of the land as exhibited in the Bible, and also of the observations of all responsible residents and travellers in that land, from Josephus and Jerome down to Von Schubert

and Von Raumer. The twenty pages devoted to a mere list of authors consulted by him — authors evidently read, not by their titles merely, but with discriminating criticism — show how complete was his preparation. He went to Palestine, therefore, to test upon the spot the accuracy of previous observers, to supply, if possible, their omissions, to correct their errors, and to verify the geographical allusions of the Scriptures, so far as this can be done by means of affiliated Arabic names, and from local scenery, monuments, and ruins.

Upon his first visit to the Holy Land, Dr. Robinson laid down a canon of criticism respecting traditional localities, which he re-affirms with emphasis in his new volume. This canon is, that "*all ecclesiastical tradition respecting the ancient places in and around Jerusalem, and throughout Palestine, is of no value, except so far as it is supported by circumstances known to us from the Scriptures, or from other cotemporary testimony.*"

As a reason for this canon, Dr. Robinson affirms that the traditions concerning the sacred localities in Palestine were, for the most part, brought forward by a credulous and unenlightened zeal, like that of the Empress Helena, who might well be styled the mother of holy places; that the fathers and monks who originated them were, for the most part, strangers in Palestine, ignorant of its topography, and of the language of the common people; that, for many centuries, the only visitors to Palestine were pilgrims, who went thither with an unquestioning belief in the traditions of the Church; and that later travellers in the Holy Land have, for the most part, been under the tutelage and guidance of the monks, whose faith and whose piastres both depend upon maintaining these traditions.

"In this way, and from all these causes, there has been grafted upon Jerusalem and the Holy Land a vast mass of tradition, foreign in its source and doubtful in its character, which has flourished luxuriantly and spread itself out widely over the western world. Palestine, the Holy City, and its sacred places, have been again and again portrayed according to the topography of the monks, and according to them alone. Whether travellers were Catholics or Protestants, has made little difference. All have drawn their information from the great storehouse

of the convents ; and, with few exceptions, all report it apparently with like faith, though with various fidelity. In looking through the long series of descriptions which have been given of Jerutsalem by the many travellers since the fourteenth century, it is curious to observe how very slightly the accounts differ in their topographical and traditional details. There are, indeed, occasional discrepancies in minor points, though very few of the travellers have ventured to depart from the general authority of their monastic guides. Or, even if they sometimes venture to call in question the value of this whole mass of tradition, yet they nevertheless repeat, in like manner, the stories of the convents, or, at least, give nothing better in their place.” — *Researches*, Vol. I. p. 253.

As specimens of this implicit faith of travellers in the monks, we give the following from Sir John Maundeville, in the fourteenth century, and Chateaubriand, in the nineteenth : —

“ To the west of Jerusalem is a fair church, where the tree of the cross grew. And two miles from thence is a handsome church, where our Lady met with Elizabeth, when they were both with child, and St. John stirred in his mother’s womb, and made reverence to his Creator, whom he saw not. Under the altar of that church is the place where St. John was born.” — *Maundeville*, Bohn’s ed., p. 175.

“ Tout au fond de la grotte, du côté de l’orient, est la place où la Vierge enfanta le Rédempteur des hommes. . . . A sept pas de là, vers le midi, après avoir passé l’entrée d’un des escaliers qui montent à l’église supérieure, vous trouvez la crèche. . . . A deux pas, vis-à-vis la crèche, est un autel qui occupe la place où Marie était assise lorsqu’elle présenta l’enfant des douleurs aux adorations des mages. . . . Ces lieux sont pourtant ceux-là mêmes où s’opérèrent tant de merveilles.” — *Chateaubriand*, *Itinéraire*, Tom. I. p. 399.

The credulity of the monks is fully equalled by that of the Jews in their traditions of sacred places. Thus Rabbi Petachia states that in Mount Gaash, in Upper Galilea, “ a footprint is perceptible, like that of a human being treading on snow. This is that which the angel imprinted after the death of Joshua, son of Nun, when the land of Israel was shaken.” At Hebron he bribed his way into the cave of the patriarchs. “ But over the entrance, in the middle, are placed very thick iron bars,—the like no man can make, unless through heavenly

instrumentality,— and a storm-wind blows from between the holes between bar and bar. He could not enter there with lights. Whenever he bent towards the mouth of the cave, a storm-wind went forth, and cast him backwards.” In the same vein the Rabbi describes the “Gate of Mercy” at Jerusalem, probably the so-called “Golden Gate,” concerning which the tradition is common to Jews, Christians, and Moslems, that the Divine glory shall there appear for the recapture of the city. It seems that in Petachia’s time the Crusaders were as watchful of this gate as the Moslems now are. “No Jew, and still less a Gentile, is permitted to go there. One day, the Gentiles wished to remove the rubbish, and open the gate; but the whole land of Israel shook, and there was a tumult in the city until they left off.”*

Having repudiated ecclesiastical tradition as a guide, Drs. Robinson and Smith laid down these two general principles to govern their researches in the Holy Land:—*first*, “to avoid, as far as possible, all contact with the convents, and the authority of the monks; to examine everywhere for ourselves, with the Scriptures in our hands, and to apply for information solely to the native Arab population”; and, *secondly*, “to leave, as much as possible, the beaten track, and direct our journeys and researches to those portions of the country which had been least visited.”

The determination to avoid contact with the convents and the monks may seem to argue a weakness, or a superciliousness, which are alike foreign to the ordinary tone of our author’s mind. We confess, indeed, to having formed the same determination after a little experience of Oriental travel, but upon grounds less elaborate and scientific than those which Dr. Robinson sets forth. We avoided the convents because we found their larders scanty, their cooking execrable, their beds untidy, and their vermin abundant and voracious; and, withal, because the holy brethren, while thus superior to the demands of the flesh, made ghostly exactions upon our purses “for the love of God,” equal to the tariff of first-class

* Travels of Petachia. Translated from the Hebrew by Dr. A. Benisch. London: Trübner & Co. 1856.—Petachia visited the Holy Land toward the close of the twelfth century.

hotels. Sir John Maundeville testifies of the convent at Mount Sinai, that "in that abbey no flies, toads, or lizards, or such foul, venomous beasts, nor lice, nor fleas, ever enter, by the miracle of God and of our Lady; for there were wont to be so many such kind of pests, that the monks were resolved to leave the place, and were gone thence to the mountain above, to eschew that place. But Our Lady came to them, and bade them return; and since that time such vermin have never entered in the place amongst them, nor never shall enter hereafter."* But, whatever may have been Maundeville's experience in 1322, we do testify that in 1853 Our Lady's charm had lost its potency; and we do not hesitate upon this point to adopt Dr. Robinson's canon, that "ecclesiastical tradition is of no value, when not supported by circumstances known to us." Thus much for the convents.

As to the monks, they generally appeared amiable, indolent, and ignorant, with here and there an exception of vivacious intelligence or of earnest devotion. Such independent observers as those concerned in the Biblical Researches of 1838 had nothing to apprehend from monkish authority over their private judgments. We never could quite forgive Dr. Robinson for his cavalier treatment of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre during his first visit to Jerusalem. We believe that on that occasion he entered the church but once, when he "looked in for a few moments, with a friend," upon the Latin mass at nine o'clock on the morning of Easter Sunday. The traditionists have made much of this contemptuous neglect of the reputed site of the Sepulchre, as an evidence that Dr. Robinson rejected the traditions concerning that site upon arbitrary and *a priori* grounds, without a fair investigation.

During his second visit, Dr. Robinson retrieved that omission, and made a most careful inspection of the so-called tomb of Joseph and Nicodemus, on the western side of the rotunda. The result of that visit was to turn the strong-hold of the traditionists against themselves, and to demonstrate upon archaeological grounds, as the author had before demonstrated upon both topographical and historical grounds, that the genuineness of the present site of the Holy Sepulchre is sustained

* Bohn's edition, p. 158.

by no valid argument or authority. We shall speak again of this result, in considering the topography of Jerusalem.

Recurring to the canon laid down by Drs. Robinson and Smith to guide their researches, we find that, in determining any locality, it gives to the Scriptures the first place of authority; next to these, it places "other contemporary testimony"; and next to this, the evidence from names and associations surviving in the language of the native Arab population. This last may in some sense be styled tradition. But there is an obvious distinction between such native indigenous traditions and associations, and traditions whose origin and intent are ecclesiastical. The tenacity of the common speech of the common people in respect to names and local associations is strikingly exemplified in the Saxon element of the English tongue. In speech the Saxon conquered the Norman; so that to this day, in the dialect of the English island, as Mr. Emerson phrases it, "the male principle is the Saxon; the female, the Latin. The children and laborers use the Saxon unmixed. The Latin unmixed is abandoned to the colleges and Parliament." Not Stonehenge itself is more fixed and commanding upon the wide expanse of Salisbury Plain, than are the sturdy pillars of Saxon uplifted on the face of English literature. At every summer solstice, the sun still greets them in their ancient place.

What is true of the vernacular speech of progressive, changeful England, is even more true of the common language of the impassive, stereotyped Orient. There every mound and stone and pillar is a Stonehenge, which changes neither form nor place through ages of decay. The names of *Nimrood* and of *Neby Yūnas* still survive upon the banks of the Tigris. *Libnān* and *Yāfa* still designate the Lebanon and Japho of the Hebrew Scriptures. The common Arab population, aside from ordinary routes of travel, untainted with ecclesiastical traditions and superstitions, unbiassed by any motive to err or to deceive, are unquestionably a better authority for the names of places in Palestine, than are the monks of Nazareth or Bethlehem. A complete mastery of the Arabic tongue, combined with a thorough knowledge of Arabic character, enabled Dr. Eli Smith to pursue this linguistic branch of the

researches with remarkable success. The identification of many localities established by these researches was due in a good degree to that worthy missionary, whom Gesenius once accredited as the first living Arabic scholar. When to this rare qualification of his associate were united the exact, complete, and critical learning of Dr. Robinson upon the points of inquiry, and his keen and patient observation of places and of incidents, it was almost impossible that a fact should be overlooked, or an error be recorded, in the Researches. An explorer who went to Palestine knowing exactly what to seek and where to seek it, and who took his own bearings by the compass every half-hour, and registered the thermometer four times a day, could hardly go astray either in his facts or in his judgments.

One of the best examples of the application of Dr. Robinson's canon of investigation, is given in the identifying of *Kâna el-Jelîl* as the scene of the first miracle of Christ. A small village called *Kefr Kenna*, an hour and a half northeast from Nazareth, is asserted by the monks of the latter town to be the Cana of the New Testament. Such has been the tradition of the past two centuries; and "so fixed has the impression now become that this was the true Cana, that most travellers probably are not aware of there ever having been a question as to the identity." The allusions of many of the earlier travellers to Cana are too brief and indefinite to shed much light upon its locality. Maundrell did not go to the place, but "passed in view" of it, on the way from Nazareth to Acre, "going at first northward, crossing the hills that encompass the vale of Nazareth on that side, and then turning to the westward."* Maundeville only says that "Cana is four miles from Nazareth"; but gives no hint of the direction. And besides, little confidence could be placed in one who gravely records the following item: "Half a mile from Nazareth is the leap of our Lord; for the Jews led him upon a high rock, to make him leap down, and have slain him; but Jesus passed amongst them, and leaped upon another rock; and the steps of his feet are still to be seen in the rock where

* Journal of April 20 (A. D. 1697).

he alighted.”* Sæwulf is a little more precise. He says: “Six miles to the northeast of Nazareth, on a hill, is Cana of Galilee, where our Lord converted water into wine at the marriage feast. There nothing is left standing, except the monastery called that of Architriclinus”† (the Ruler of the Feast). Dr. Robinson regards this statement of Sæwulf as applicable not to Kefr Kenna, but to Kâna el-Jelîl. But since the rebuilding of the church and convent at Nazareth in the early part of the seventeenth century, tradition has uniformly and strongly pointed to Kefr Kenna as the Cana of the New Testament.

Kâna el-Jelîl is a ruin on the northern border of the plain el-Büttauf, about three hours distant from Nazareth, in a north-easterly direction. It was first pointed out to Dr. Robinson from the Wely above Nazareth, by an Arab-Greek Christian of that town. The prevalence of the ancient name among the common people, in opposition to the tradition of the monks, is with Dr. Robinson a sufficient reason for “rejecting the present monastic position at Kefr-Kenna,” and fixing the site of Cana at Kâna el-Jelîl. “The name is identical, and stands the same in the Arabic version of the New Testament; while the form Kefr-Kenna can only be twisted by force into a like shape.” Moreover, Kâna el-Jelîl “is sufficiently near to Nazareth to accord with all the circumstances of the history.” Thus, two conditions of the canon are fulfilled; the site of Kâna el-Jelîl answers to the Biblical narrative, and it is determined by the permanence of the name in the language of the native Arab population.

But Dr. Robinson presents much more than this negative evidence against the claims of Kefr Kenna. He shows that “an earlier tradition actually regarded the present Kâna as the ancient Cana”; that, according to Quaresimus, so lately as at the commencement of the seventeenth century, “two Canas were spoken of among the inhabitants of Nazareth and the vicinity, one called simply Cana of Galilee (Kâna el-Jelîl), and the other Sepher Cana (Kefr Kenna)”; and further, that many earlier travellers in Palestine place Cana north of Sep-

* Chap. X. (A. D. 1322).

† Travels (A. D. 1103).

phoris, and describe it as "having a mountain on the north, and a broad, fertile, and beautiful plain towards the south; all which corresponds to the position of Kâna, and not to Kefr Kenna." These arguments are conclusive in favor of Kâna el-Jelîl as the true site of the Cana of the New Testament. The tradition concerning Kefr Kenna obviously originated with the monks of the convent at Nazareth, as best suited to their convenience.

Since the first edition of the Biblical Researches was published, nearly all intelligent travellers, and the best geographers, have adopted Kâna el-Jelîl as the true site of Cana. Munk, whose admirable work just *preceded* the Researches, makes Cana the modern *Kefer Kanna*.* Houzé, whose latest map of Palestine is that of 1848, places Cana in the site of Kâna el-Jelîl, retaining also the site of Kefr Kenna, but without giving the Arabic names. Kiepert follows Dr. Robinson. Ritter also makes Cana identical with Kâna el-Jelîl. Bagster's Chronological Atlas identifies Kâna el-Jelîl with the Cana of the New Testament, as demonstrated by the "powerful arguments" of Dr. Robinson. Dr. Wilson, who is slow to acknowledge Robinson's authority, speaks of Kâna el-Jelîl as the Cana of Galilee, which was privileged to witness the beginning of our Lord's miracles.† Van de Velde, who, however, can hardly be called an original authority, accepts the decision of Dr. Robinson in favor of Kâna el-Jelîl. We are therefore the more surprised to find Mr. Stanley still in doubt. Without entering upon the question, he only says: "The claims of Cana are almost equally balanced between the two modern villages of that name,—the one situated at some distance, in the corner of the basin of Sepphorieh, the other nearer, in an upland village, to the east of Nazareth."‡

Horne, in the new edition of his "Introduction," exhibits a carelessness upon this point that is truly surprising. Although he has corrected much in the geographical portion of his work, upon the authority of the Researches of Dr. Robinson, yet in his article on *Cana*, in the Geographical Dictionary appended to the third volume, he ignores the disputed question as to the

* Palestine, p. 35 b.

† Sinai and Palestine, p. 359.

‡ Lands of the Bible, Vol. II. p. 94.

site of Cana, but so describes the place as to leave no doubt that Kefr Kenna is in his mind, while he gravely remarks that it is "a small town of Galilee, situated on a gentle eminence *to the west of Capernaum.*" This mode of designating the locality has at least the merit of being as safe as it is original.

We have dwelt thus long upon this example, because it furnishes so fine an illustration of Dr. Robinson's method of investigation and its results. It is in fact an *experimentum crucis* of the principles laid down in his canon. But while we would congratulate our countryman upon his success in thus arraying Scripture, history, language, and reason against a mere monkish tradition, and upon the tribute which the learned world has accorded to his judgment, we would not have it supposed that he has one whit subdued that monkish tradition in Palestine itself, or broken its charm with travellers who are susceptible to superstition. Of this class is the eccentric M. de Saulcy, who, while nervously suspicious of an Arab, always clings tenaciously to a monk. He attempts to refute "the seductive arguments of the learned Dr. Robinson," as to the true site of Cana, and, as he thinks, "completely destroys them all." His arguments are three, which we present in an inverted order.

The first is drawn from a criticism of the sacred text (John ii. 1). "How could Jesus," he asks, "starting from Nazareth for the purpose of proceeding to Capernaum, have thought of going out of his way four or five leagues to the northward, when his easiest, shortest, and most natural course was evidently to take the beaten road from Nazareth to Capernaum, which road passed of necessity by Kefr Kenna?" But the Evangelist makes the marriage the motive of the journey from Nazareth, and not a mere incident upon the way from Nazareth to Capernaum, though Jesus afterwards went down to the lake. Beside, Kâna el-Jelîl is but about fifteen miles from Nazareth, and not much of a detour from the road to Capernaum. Alford, who is keenly alive to the minutest points of criticism, remarks: "Dr. Robinson satisfactorily establishes that Kâna el-Jelîl, about three hours N. $\frac{1}{2}$ E. from Nazareth, is the site of this miracle. The name is identical, and

so stands in the Arabic version of the New Testament. He shows this to have been recognized in early tradition, and only recently usurped by Kefr Kenna, a village one and a half hours northeast from Nazareth, on one of the roads to Tiberias.”*

M. de Sauley’s second argument is historical. He does not deny that “an old tradition pretended to identify the Cana of the Gospel with Kâna el-Jelîl”; but he insists that Quaresimus had good reason to reject that tradition for the evidence in favor of Kefr Kenna as the true locality. This evidence he makes to consist mainly in “the tradition of a church built upon the identical spot of the miracle,” whose ruins De Sauley professes to identify with those of an ancient mosque near the modern church in Kefr Kenna, and in the existence there of two water-pots, “as old as the time of the miracle.” The weighty testimony of most earlier writers in favor of Kâna el-Jelîl he attempts to offset by the ambiguous evidence of Phocas in the twelfth century, of Willibald in the eighth, and of Antoninus the Martyr in the sixth, who certifies that he not only saw two of the original water-pots of Christ’s miracle, but that he “filled one with water, and drew forth wine”!

His third argument is linguistic. “The words Cana of Galilee could never have been expressed by Kâna el-Jelîl. This last word is positively an adjective, meaning great, or illustrious. I then most conscientiously declare, that, according to my interpretation, and I dare say according to the interpretation of any native scholar, the words Kâna el-Jelîl cannot have any other meaning than *Kana the Great*, or *Kana the illustrious*.” To this Dr. Robinson quietly but effectually replies: “Had M. de Sauley turned to his Arabic New Testament, he would have found, not only that *Galilee* (*Γαλιλαία*) is always rendered by *el-Jelîl*, but also that *Cana of Galilee* (*Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας*), wherever it occurs, is uniformly given by *Kâna el-Jelîl* (John ii. 1, 11; iv. 46; xxi. 2).”

Dr. Robinson having expressed the wish, in his first edition, that future travellers would bear in mind the true Cana, and would verify his conclusions, we made a memorandum of the

* Commentary on John ii. 1.

bearings of Kâna el-Jelîl from Nazareth, and resolved to satisfy ourselves of its identity with the Cana of John. The success of this endeavor may be learned from the following extract from our unpublished journal, which, in imitation of Mr. Stanley, we here introduce, to relieve the tedium of dissertation. We take the liberty of retaining the first person singular:—

“ *Nazareth, May 28th, 1853.* In planning a tour of Palestine, it was a first consideration to include in it as many places of interest as could be brought within the time allotted, and especially such places of sacred association as had been identified by reliable authorities. But Dr. Robinson has so completely upset both the topography of Palestine and the traditions of the elders, that one might as well attempt to explore Japan before the friendly expedition of the United States has opened its gates, as to go out of the beaten track to verify any of his discoveries in this stereotyped land. Once or twice I succeeded in getting upon his route, and found it marked at every step by the most learned and cautious accuracy. But there seems to be a universal conspiracy among dragomans, guides, sheiks, guards, monks, moukris, horses, and mules, to ignore every place that Dr. Robinson has identified, and to follow still the beaten way. My own dragoman, who has long resided in Syria, and is well acquainted with the country, and by far the most intelligent and obliging of his class that I have seen, though he has travelled with Rev. Dr. Keith, and with Mr. Bartlett the artist, often tells me that nobody ever before asked him about such and such places, or expressed any desire to visit them !

“ There was one place that I was determined, if possible, to see, namely, the true Cana of Galilee. I had read with interest Dr. Robinson’s opinion as to the location of this village, and had seen Lord Nugent’s ill-natured criticism upon it ; I had also just read, at Jerusalem, Dr. Robinson’s re-affirmation of his view in a late number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. With the aid of Kiepert’s map, and of Dr. Robinson’s description, there was no difficulty in fixing the spot ; and I was rejoiced to find that my dragoman knew the place, though he had never been led to attach any importance to it as the real Cana. Accordingly, I stipulated that this place should be comprised within our northward route. Before leaving Tiberias, I took special pains to have it understood by the dragoman, and the mounted guard that accompanied us, that we did not wish to go to Nazareth by the beaten track of *Lâbîeh* and *Kefr Kenna* (the traditional Cana), but by a more northern path around the base of Jebel Hattîn, and by Rummâneh across el-Büttauf

to *Kâna el-Jelîl*, and thence due south to Nazareth. All this was agreed upon before starting. But we had not been an hour on our way before I suspected that we were on the wrong path, — a suspicion that was soon confirmed by seeing Lûbieh in the distance. The dragoman assured me, however, that the guard had undertaken to lead us to *Kâna el-Jelîl* by a more direct route; but, on inquiry, I was satisfied that the guard had quite mistaken my instructions.

“At about eleven o’clock we reached the traditional Cana, where I saw the little Greek chapel in which are deposited two huge stone jars said to have been used at the marriage feast. The chapel was deliciously cool, while, without, the thermometer ranged above 100°; and if the water-pots had only been filled with iced Croton, I should, without further inquiry, have indorsed this as the place of the beginning of miracles. Determined to see the other Cana also, I made an arrangement to go there with a guide from this place, and one of our mounted guard. One of my comrades concluded to join the expedition, while the rest of the party proceeded directly to Nazareth.

“The illness of the cook made it desirable that both dragomans should go on to Nazareth to make ready the tents and the evening meal; so, with a guide fully instructed as to the object of our search, — which he professed to know perfectly, — we set out, without an interpreter, for a detour of some three or four hours. At a distance of some twenty minutes from Kefr Kenna, the guide turned aside to a little mound partly covered with wheat, and, showing us the scanty remains of a wall and a small tank, insisted that this was *Khirbet Kana*. At the same time our cavalier proposed that we should now go to Nazareth! Their eyes seemed to betray a trick, and a collusion between them to get the *buksheesh* without performing the stipulated service; so, remounting my horse, and indicating the positions of *Kefr Menda* and of *Rummâneh* respectively, I pointed to a spot between the two, as the true site of Cana, and rode off quietly in that direction. But this sort of demonstration, which had hitherto proved effectual with refractory Arabs in the desert, had no effect upon our redoubtable cavalier. He rode after me a few paces, shouting *Hawagee!* then handed me the water-skin, and headed his horse for Nazareth, the guide accompanying him. This was cool, — as much as to say, ‘You may be thirsty before you get back; so you may as well take water with you on your lonely expedition.’ We now came to a parley. I offered more *buksheesh* if they would take us to *Kâna el-Jelîl*, and refused any for this sham service.

“At first, both guard and guide denied that there was any such place; then, pointing to the sun, they represented it as too far, and

refused to go. I felt sure that it was but about an hour's ride around the base of the mountain a little in advance of me; but, in the confusion of the moment, instead of calling upon the Arabs to name the neighboring mountains, I called from the map the names of the *Tells* near Cana, and the fellows put every one of these as far off as I could see. Again I set out to go forward, hoping that they would follow; but the guide would not stir, and the guard rode off toward Nazareth, looking back upon us with a most provoking leer. Here was a predicament,—two strangers in a turbulent region, having no Arabic at hand, but obliged to converse through monosyllables and signs, deserted by their hired protectors at the outset of an afternoon journey of some five hours. We could do nothing but turn back toward Nazareth, leaving it to Dr. Robinson to find Kâna el-Jelil, if he could. If he had never disturbed its locality, instead of being left in doubt of its very existence, I might have spent the sultry noon in that cool little church, and, bating a phrenological want of veneration, might have imagined myself in the very house of the bridegroom, with the identical water-jars before me; or I might have reposed upon the neighboring stone from which the multitudes were fed with five loaves and two fishes. Fresh from the scene of the *latest* miracle of Christ,—the miraculous draught of fishes at the Sea of Tiberias, after his resurrection,—I longed to enjoy the associations of the *first* miracle at Cana,—associations quite apart from the intrusions of monkish superstition. But in this I was doomed to disappointment.

“When we reached Nazareth and told the story, the dragoman was ready to flog the cavalier on the spot. He had taken the utmost pains with the guide, who had agreed to go to *Khirbet Kana*, about two hours distant from *Kefr Kenna*, and to show us there the remains of a fosse, &c. belonging to the ancient town; so the real difficulty seemed to have been with the guard, who wished to save himself and his horse an extra ride. But though I lost the personal association of the miracle with its true site, I have no doubt of the correctness of Dr. Robinson's opinion as to that site; while I am equally clear that it is not my province to identify localities, or to verify his conclusions.”

The tour of Drs. Robinson and Smith in Palestine in 1852 was far from being a repetition of the tour of 1838. With the exception of a single excursion into the vicinity of Hebron, the map exhibits no trace of the second tour south of Jerusalem. The scenes of the second exploration were mainly Galilee and the regions east and west of the great northern road leading from Jerusalem by Nâbulus. The heart of

Galilee was thoroughly explored ; occasional excursions were made to the east of the Jordan ; the district of Lebanon was crossed in all directions ; the most northern bounds of ancient Phœnicia were visited, and the great plain of Cœle Syria was traversed in its entire length. The most northerly point attained was *el-Husn*, and the most easterly, *Riblah*. Dr. Robinson's plan of visiting the Haurân was frustrated ; but this is the less to be regretted, since Mr. Porter has furnished us with so admirable a map of that district, drawn from his own accurate observations.

Some idea of the results of Dr. Robinson's second tour to geographical science may be formed from the fact, that nearly fifty ancient places were then visited or identified for the first time by a Frank traveller. The number of such places visited or identified for the first time in the tour of 1838 was about one hundred and twenty. The determination of all these places may be fairly credited to Dr. Robinson. One of the most interesting results of these researches is the identifying of three of the Ramahs of Scripture ; that of Benjamin at *er-Râm*, near the road from Jerusalem to Bethel ;* that of Naphtali, and that of Asher. Another point of interest is the probable identity of the *Emmaus* of the New Testament with the ancient *Nicopolis*, which is unquestionably represented by the modern *'Amwâs*, about twenty minutes east of *el-Lâtrôn*, the well-known fortress of the Romans and the Crusaders on the road from Joppa to Jerusalem. We saw *'Amwâs* from the road, but had not time to visit it. We were satisfied, however, from a thorough cross-examination of our native Arab attendants, that Kiepert's map of 1840, which locates Emmaus to the southwest of *el-Lâtrôn*, was in error.† The correction appears in the recent maps of Kiepert. Ritter, however, locates *'Amwâs* or Nicopolis northwest of *el-Lâtrôn*, for which there is no authority.

The excursion of Dr. Robinson to Pella beyond Jordan and his return by way of Beth-shean was full of interest and excitement. Notwithstanding the ignorance of his guides, and the extreme haste with which the examination was conducted,

* " *Er-Ram* is certainly Ramah of Benjamin." — Stanley, p. 210.

† We made this correction of Kiepert in *The Independent* of July 14, 1853.

we feel sure that he has identified the spot where the Christians of the first century found a refuge during the siege of Jerusalem. Both the historical and topographical arguments are conclusive; though the actual inspection of the ruins of Fahil was made between 1.55 and 2.10 P. M., i. e. in fifteen minutes! We trust that some future explorer will devote at least a day to that vicinity, if this can be done with safety.

We are not so well satisfied with Dr. Robinson's argument for the identity of *Sákút* on the *west* side of the Jordan in the Ghôr, with the *Succoth* to which Jacob journeyed after his reconciliation with Esau. Notwithstanding the strong arguments of our author in favor of this view, we must still think that, to meet the conditions of the narrative, Succoth should be sought upon the eastern side of the Jordan. It is at least an open question. Schwarz marks Sukkoth with a note of interrogation, upon the western side of the Jordan, near the southeastern extremity of Gilboa, but not within the Ghôr. His map, however, does not accurately represent the mountainous borders of that region. The date of Schwarz's map is 5607, i. e. A. D. 1847, and he must have been acquainted with Dr. Robinson's Researches, though we do not find that he mentions them. His map corresponds with Robinson's also in the discrimination between *Kâna* and *Kefr Kenna*, which indeed is now followed by all respectable authorities.

To sum up in one glance the results embodied in these three volumes: draw a line from Bethel, a few miles north of Jerusalem, to Lydda, near Joppa, and another from Engedi, down the western shore of the Dead Sea, to Gaza in the southwestern corner of Palestine, and the country included within these lines is crossed and recrossed by Dr. Robinson's routes of travel so thoroughly, that hardly an important point within the limits of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Simeon, and Dan remains unvisited. The author, however, did not explore the coast of the Mediterranean from Gaza to Carmel. It shows how little he was influenced by mere sentiment, that he should have gone within sight of Joppa and Carmel without visiting either; but the fact was, that both were so well ascertained that he could have no occasion to visit them as an explorer, and mere curiosity, or

even historical and religious association, was not with him a prominent motive. From Bethel his first route was northward, by Sychar, across the plain of Esdraelon to Nazareth, then eastward by Tabor to Tiberias, thence along the coast northward to Safed, and then in a northwesterly direction to Tyre. The second route, within these bounds, consists of two zigzag tracks, with frequent detours, the one lying to the west of the first, the other to the east, and sometimes crossing the Jordan. Thus the country between a line from Bethel to Joppa, and another from the head of the Sea of Tiberias to Acre,—the region of Samaria and Galilee, or the inheritance of Ephraim, Gad, Manasseh, Issachar, and Zebulon,—was pretty well explored longitudinally.

After this the route, as has already been indicated, traversed the valley of the Huleh, and the great vale of Coele Syria. This northern section of the tour is the most novel and interesting. Upon every point which he visits, Dr. Robinson sheds the light of history and of scholarly investigation. Even where other men of learning and ability have preceded him, he brings forth from his treasure things new and old. His description of Baalbek is an example of this, making that wondrous ruin real to those who have not seen it, and intelligible to those who have. At Damascus, of course, Mr. Porter is much more at home than any transient visitor could be; yet even there Dr. Robinson's notes are valuable.

In the neighborhood of the great convent of Mâr Jirjis el-Humeira, at the northernmost extremity of his tour, Dr. Robinson visited the intermitting fountain (Fauwâr ed-Deir), the identity of which with the Sabbatical River of Josephus* was first suggested by Rev. Mr. Thomson of the Syrian Mission, in 1840. This fountain issues from a small cavern in the limestone rock, and flows at very irregular intervals,—sometimes two or three times a week, and sometimes not for twenty or thirty days. The same popular belief which obtained among the Jews as to its flowing only upon the Sabbath, now exists among the Mohammedans of that region, who say that the fountain flows only on Friday, the Moslem Sabbath. A

* Bell. Jud. VII. 5. 1.

similar instance of credulity is found in the account given by Rabbi Petachia of Ratisbon, of intermittent fountains visited by him in the twelfth century. "At Yabneh [*Jamnia* on the Mediterranean] there is a spring which flows all six days, but on Sabbath not a single drop is found in it. In lower Galilea there is a cave which inside is spacious and high. On one side of the cave are buried Shammai and his disciples, and on the other Hillel and his disciples. In the middle of the cave there is a large stone, hollow like a cup, which is capable of containing more than forty seah. When men of worth enter, the stone appears full of sweet water. One may then wash his hands and feet, and pray, imploring God for what one desires. The stone, however, is not hollow from below, for the water does not come from the bottom, as it only occurs in honor of a man of worth, since to an unworthy man the water does not appear. Though one should draw from the stone a thousand jugs of water, it would not be diminished, but would remain full as before."*

But the most interesting topic in the new volume — and, with the exception of the discussion of the position of Israel at Sinai, the most valuable result of the original researches — is the topography of Jerusalem, especially with reference to the site of the Holy Sepulchre. Here Dr. Robinson's assaults upon ecclesiastical tradition were most vigorous and effective, and it is therefore at this point that the first edition of the Researches has provoked the most earnest opposition. Foremost among the champions of the traditional site of the sepulchre is Mr. Williams,† fortified by the topographical and architectural arguments of Professor Willis. In the archæological argument, Mr. Williams had a seeming advantage in the fact that Dr. Robinson did not, at his first visit, personally inspect the so-called sepulchre of Joseph and Nicodemus. This error, as we have before stated, Dr. Robinson has abundantly retrieved in his third volume; and his masterly argument against the identity of the alleged with the actual site of the Holy Sepulchre is now complete at every point. But the controversy is not yet at rest. We do not

* Travels, Trübner's edition, p. 57.

† The Holy City, Vol. II.

propose to enter upon it here, but only to give a *résumé* of the arguments upon both sides.

Mr. Stanley modestly declines any “attempt to unravel the tangled controversy of the identity of the Holy Sepulchre.” But he presents the question at issue with admirable clearness.

“It is enough to state that the argument mainly turns on the solution of two questions, one historical, the other topographical. The historical question rests on the value of the tradition that the spot was marked before the time of Constantine by a temple or statue of Venus, which the Emperor Hadrian had erected in order to pollute a spot already in his time regarded as sacred by the Christians. The topographical question is, whether the present site can be proved to have stood without the walls of Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion.”

— p. 452.

The most careful and candid summary of the argument for the identity of the alleged site of the Holy Sepulchre is given by Thrupp. He endeavors to identify the rock now included within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as Golgotha, and he traces in it a fancied resemblance to a human skull. He assumes that this name, applied to a bold, rocky knoll, was perpetuated among the natives of Jerusalem until the date of the erection, by the Emperor Constantine, of the present church, or rather of the original edifice upon its site. This supposed identification of the rock Golgotha, “establishes the approximate locality of the sepulchre.” The identity of the site now pointed out as the place of burial, he argues from the statement of Eusebius concerning its discovery by Constantine. The place was surmounted and polluted by a temple of Venus. In removing this temple to the foundations, the workmen unexpectedly came upon a rock-hewn sepulchre. But the narrative of this affair in Eusebius is so tinged with the marvellous, that Mr. Thrupp is “forced to admit that the chain of traditional evidence for the authenticity of the present sepulchre is by no means so perfect as has been sometimes represented.”*

The topographical argument Mr. Thrupp presents in a some-

* *Ancient Jerusalem*, p. 273.

what novel form. He maintains that the “second wall” of Josephus is identical with the wall of Hezekiah and Manasseh, which was “without the city of David, on the west side of Gihon, in the valley, even to the entering in at the fish-gate.”* This fish-gate he assumes to be the same with the gate Gennath, or the garden-gate of Josephus. But of this he offers no proof. He places the fish-gate at the *northeastern* corner of the Upper City, and argues that the second wall “did not cross the northwestern ridge, or Christian quarter, of the northern city, but ran along the valley encircling the northern part of the Lower City, or Hill of Zion.”† This would give the second wall a total length of but 2250 feet; which very circumstance, however, Mr. Thrupp regards as confirming his theory of the course of the wall, since Josephus states that the third wall, that of Agrippa, had ninety towers, the ancient wall sixty, and the middle or second wall but forty;‡ and assuming that these towers were regularly disposed at equal intervals in the three walls, he infers that the second wall was but one sixth the length of the wall of Agrippa. Accordingly, on Mr. Thrupp’s plan, the second wall begins a little to the west of Millo, and runs northward to a line with the so-called Pool of Bethesda, where it turns to the east. This excludes almost the whole of the northwestern portion of the modern city, and of course excludes the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Mr. Thrupp finds the pool of Hezekiah in the well of the Hammâm esh-Shefa, a little to the north of the causeway Millo, which has been explored by Mr. Wolcott, Dr. Tobler, and Dr. Barclay, without, however, any visible trace of its supposed connection with the Gihon.

This view of Mr. Thrupp differs essentially from that of Mr. Williams, who places the gate Gennath about midway between Hippicus and the temple area, i. e. in the *middle* of the northern wall of the Upper City, and carries the second wall across the slope of Akra, below the site of the Church of the Sepulchre. Against the theory of Mr. Williams, Thrupp urges with much force the objection which strikes the eye of the observer upon the ground, that according to his view “the

* 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14.

† Bell. Jud. V. 4. 3.

‡ Ancient Jerusalem, p. 104.

second wall must have stood on the slope of a hill, the ground ascending from it on the outside. No position could have been worse adapted for defence; and yet the second wall was evidently regarded by the Romans as no contemptible fortification." This objection to the line proposed by Williams, Thrupp attempts to obviate by greatly reducing the area within the second wall, and confining that wall to the defence of the Lower City, along the valley, the Upper City being defended by the old wall. But we find nothing either in history, monuments, or the science of fortification that goes to establish this view.

Schwarz maintains quite the opposite extreme, and his view is worth mentioning for its singularity. On the authority of the Targumist Jonathan Ben Uzziel, who lived in Jerusalem at the time of King Herod, he identifies the tower of Hippicus with the tower of *Chananel* of Jeremiah xxxi. 38; and *this* he places to the northeast of Jeremiah's grotto. He argues from Josephus that Hippicus was on the northern side of the city, not far from the Antonia; and further, in the high rocky hill to the north of the grotto of Jeremiah, he professes to have found "some vestiges which betoken that at some time a strong building or fort must have stood there."* He describes the course of the *first* wall of Josephus on this wise: "From the northwest corner of the temple wall in a northern direction to the tower of Chananel or Hippicus, not far from Jeremiah's grotto; then, on the other side, that is, in a western direction, the wall extended from Hippicus towards the Upper Gihon, then ran southwardly around Mount Zion, then northwardly, and again southerly, and formed the double wall; ran next around the fountain of Siloah, thence past the lower pool, till it reached the Ophel, and terminated finally at the eastern gallery of the temple." This he regards as the wall of Nehemiah.

The second wall of Josephus, Schwarz regards as "the same which Jonathan the Maccabee caused to be built *within* the city, in order to separate Akra, where his enemies, the Grecians, were posted, from other parts of Jerusalem."

* Descriptive Geography of Palestine, p. 251.

This theory brings the Church of the Holy Sepulchre within the *first* wall. The Rabbi adds: "It is clearly proved, from what has been said, that the alleged grave of Christ is quite wrong; as it must have been indisputably without the city, at a distance at least of 100 paces, or 50 cubits, according to *Bava Bathra*, 2. 9."

These speculations are interesting as coming from purely Jewish sources. Rabbi Joseph Schwarz resided for sixteen years in Palestine, and devoted much attention to the geography and the natural history of the country. His chapters on the products of Palestine in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, are particularly valuable. He describes the plague of locusts, which he witnessed in 1837, and again in 1845. His notes upon the synagogues of Jerusalem, and the Jews of Palestine, are also of special interest to the Christian reader. Had he been more familiar with the labors of Gentile scholars, the geographical section of his volume would have been more thorough and accurate. The work of Schwarz was printed in Hebrew at Jerusalem; but a good English translation by Isaac Leeser has been published in Philadelphia.

Dr. Robinson, in his third volume, sums up with his usual ability the controverted points of the argument brought forward in his first edition for the course of the second wall from the vicinity of Hippicus northward to the Damascus gate. He justly remarks, that "it is only by a careful consideration of *all* the particulars specified by Josephus, and by a cautious comparison of each with the features of the surface as still seen, or as known from history, that we can hope to arrive at legitimate and trustworthy conclusions." Regarding the ancient tower just south of the Yâfa Gate as the Hippicus of Josephus, he argues, as we think conclusively, that the Gate Gennath, or the *Garden Gate*, which "led out of Zion to the country," was near to Hippicus. The Tyropœon he regards as beginning, not near the Damascus Gate, and running southwards to Siloam, but near the Yâfa Gate, and running down along the northern side of Zion. This identifies Akra as the "gibbous" ridge on which the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands. The Pool of Hezekiah is probably the reservoir

that still bears his name. The ancient remains connected with the present Damascus Gate, Dr. Robinson regards as those of an ancient gate belonging to the second wall of Josephus. That author thus briefly describes the course of the second wall: "The second wall had its beginning from the gate called Gennath belonging to the first wall; and encircling only the tract on the north, it extended quite to Antonia."* The problem then is simply to describe a wall from Hippicus to the Damascus Gate across the ridge of Akra, in such a manner as to embrace the Pool of Hezekiah, and both to enlarge the area of the city and to defend it upon its north-western side. A careful inspection of the map will show that, to fulfil these conditions, the wall must have run to the west of the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and therefore that site, having been within the walls, cannot be accepted as genuine. What may be thus clearly traced upon the map, is most palpable to the eye from any point that commands the whole western and northern range of the modern city. Yet Tischendorf follows almost implicitly the traditions of the monks, and argues against Dr. Robinson for the genuineness of the alleged site of the sepulchre.†

To sum up the topographical argument, the line of the second wall adopted by Thrupp, after Krafft,‡ must be rejected as narrowing the city too much, as ill planned for defence, and as faulty in the position of Gennath. The course advocated by Williams must be decidedly rejected for the last two reasons. That suggested by Schwarz is opposed to a mass of evidence which identifies the tower near the Jaffa Gate with the Hippicus of Josephus. The line proposed by Dr. Robinson comes nearer than any other to the vague and general statement of Josephus concerning the course of the second wall, taken in connection with other points of reference given by the Jewish historian. Upon the whole, while we strongly incline to Dr. Robinson's view, we would unite with Isaac Taylor in the belief so well expressed in his edition of Traill's Josephus, that,

* Bell. Jud. V. 4. 2.

‡ *Die Topographie Jerusalem.*

† *Reise in den Orient*, von Constantin Tischendorf.

“in the almost inevitable progress of European affairs, Palestine must come under the wing of one of the great European States; that this land will receive, ere long, a Christian and civilized government,—will have a police,—will afford a secure and tranquil liberty of travel and of residence,—a liberty of wandering and of strolling about, even as one does in the Highlands of Scotland or in the valleys of Switzerland; that it will give leisurely opportunity to dig and to trench, to upturn and to excavate. When such a time comes, or within a period of five years after it has come, Palestine—a region not more extensive than any three adjoining English counties—will have opened its long-hidden secrets to antiquarian eyes; its few square miles of soil, teeming with historic materials, will have been, if not *sifted*, yet turned over, or pierced here and there; and, especially, the lowest basements of the Holy City will have been moved from their places, or sufficiently exposed to view.

“Such a time will not pass without yielding evidence enough for constructing an *authentic* plan of Ancient Jerusalem; and may it not be well, until then, to hold in suspense our opinion, whatever it may be, on matters which, at present, cannot be conclusively determined? Let the Turk retire, and the topographer may step forward.”—Vol. II. p. cxxi.

The historical argument for the alleged site of the Holy Sepulchre Dr. Robinson does not handle quite so successfully as the topographical. Still, he grapples vigorously with the tradition, and labors with much earnestness and force to show that, in the time of Constantine, there was no “such historical evidence or tradition respecting the place of our Lord’s sepulchre, as to lead to the selection of the present site as the true one”; but that, according to Eusebius, “the discovery of the sepulchre was the result, not of a previous knowledge derived from tradition, but of a supernatural intimation.” It seems to us that Dr. Robinson here strains a little the language of Eusebius to make his point, and that there is more validity in the objection, that, even had there existed a tradition of the site of the Sepulchre before the time of Constantine, “it could have had no authority in opposition to the clear and definite topographical evidence.” Such a tradition is fairly matched by those concerning the place of the Ascension, and that of the martyrdom of Stephen, both which are known to be erroneous.

The objection is of no force against Dr. Robinson's view, that he suggests no site of the Sepulchre as a substitute for the present. This he was not bound to do; nor do we find any data from which such a conjecture could be framed. Indeed, with respect to the sepulchre of Christ, we prefer to rest in that sublime indefiniteness of place which Keble so finely expresses as to Gethsemane, in answer to the wish to trace each sacred spot:—

“It may not be :

Th’ unearthly thoughts have passed from earth away,
And, fast as evening sunbeams from the sea,
Thy footsteps all, in Sion’s deep decay,
Were blotted from the holy ground: yet dear
Is every stone of hers; for Thou wast surely here.

“There is a spot within this sacred dale
That felt Thee kneeling, touched Thy prostrate brow:
One Angel knows it.”

Mr. Stanley's “Sinai and Palestine” differs widely, both in scope and in style, from the “Biblical Researches.” It does not search out minutely the localities of Biblical history with a view to identify these with modern sites or existing ruins; it is hardly, in any sense, a contribution to the cartography of Palestine; but it seeks so to connect sacred History and sacred Geography as to clothe the former with the reality of place as well as of time, and to give to the records of the Past the actual life of the Present. To this task Mr. Stanley brings the furniture of an extensive, if not always accurate, scholarship, the faculty of quick and pertinent observation, a fine talent for description, and a polished rhetoric. His descriptions of physical scenery are graphic and beautiful; his collocation of historical events is frequently striking and impressive, always apt and graceful; his moral reflections are just in conception, and chaste in expression. In colloquial phrase, it is a readable and companionable volume.

Occasionally, indeed, we notice a carelessness of style, especially in the fragments of the author's journal which are interspersed among graver disquisitions. Such is the anti-climax of the word “mentioned,” in an otherwise fine period touching the obelisk at Heliopolis:—

“It is the oldest known in Egypt, and therefore in the world,—the father of all that have arisen since. It was raised about a century before the coming of Joseph; it has looked down upon his marriage with Asenath; it has seen the growth of Moses; it is mentioned by Herodotus; Plato sate under its shadow; of all the obelisks which sprang up around it, it alone has kept its first position. One by one, it has seen its sons and brothers depart to great destinies elsewhere. From these gardens came the obelisks of the Lateran, of the Vatican, and of the Porta del Popolo; and this venerable pillar (for so it looks from a distance) is now almost the only landmark of the great seat of the wisdom of Egypt.”—p. xxxi.

The parenthetic clause tames down this last sentence almost as much as the matter-of-fact “mentioned” mars the poetic climax of the preceding. The opening sentence of the Introduction is a solecism. “Egypt, amongst its many other aspects of interest, has this special claim.” That which is singled out *from* other aspects, for special notice, cannot still be enumerated *amongst* those “other aspects.” We make these trifling criticisms because the learned Canon of Canterbury should be superior to such small defects of style.

In an Introduction of some twenty pages Mr. Stanley gives a bird’s-eye view of Egypt in relation to Israel. This contains some pleasant sketches of Nile scenery and of ancient monuments. But the real interest of the volume begins with the chapter on the Peninsula of Sinai. The general geographical and geological features of the peninsula are admirably described, and its historical and traditional events are introduced often with high scenic effect. It is this grouping together of the physical features and the historical incidents of the region, that is the main excellence of Mr. Stanley’s book. He paints the landscape well, and then animates it with the associations of human life. The geological maps interspersed through the volume greatly assist the reader in forming a just conception of Arabia Petræa. In this respect, the large geological map of that region by Russegger has much value. The maps of Mr. Stanley’s book strike us as generally faithful in the coloring, as well as in the outline and classification of the rocks.

But while the author is so ample in all physical and histori-

cal details, and so vivid and picturesque in his descriptions, he disappoints our expectation from him as a scholar in the settlement of disputed questions. Whenever he approaches such a question, he seems to lose confidence either in his own learning upon the subject, or in the results of his own logic; and, after arraying history and logic upon both sides, but usually with a preponderance toward one conclusion, he evades the conclusion toward which he points by some doubtful generalization. Thus he narrows down the controversy of the passage of the Red Sea to two points,—“the Wâdy Tuârick, opposite the Wells of Moses, or the immediate neighborhood of Suez”; and after a candid statement of the arguments in favor of each, he comes to the conclusion, that, “if the passage of 600,000 armed men was effected in the limits of a single night, we are compelled to look for it in the narrower end of the gulf, and not in the wide interval of eight or ten miles between the Wâdy Tuârick and the Wells of Moses.” But Mr. Stanley does not adhere to this conclusion. A few pages later, he introduces extracts from his letters written at the Wells of Moses, bearing upon the same question. In these, after stating the two principal theories of the passage, he adds:—

“It is remarkable that this event — almost the first in our religious history — should admit, on the spot itself, of both these constructions. But the mountain itself remains unchanged and certain, and so does the fact itself which it witnessed. Whether the Israelites passed over the shallow waters of Suez by the means, and within the time, which the narrative seems to imply, or whether they passed through a channel ten miles broad, with the waves on each side piled up to the height of one hundred and eighty feet, there can be no doubt that they did pass over within sight of this mountain and this desert, by a marvelous deliverance.” — p. 67.

This answers the purposes of religious feeling with one whose faith in the miracle is established. But the scholar who would test, illustrate, and confirm the miracle by topographical considerations, should aim at something higher than poetic sentiment.

Dr. Robinson, in his first volume, clearly defines the limits

of the land of Goshen. Lepsius* has identified the ruins of Abu-Keshēb with the ancient Rameses almost beyond a doubt. Osburn, in his *Monumental History of Egypt*, finds Rameses "on the western border of the Delta, about midway between the Canopic branch of the Nile and the Canal of Alexandria"; and hence argues that the Wady et-Tih must have been the scene of the journey from Egypt to the Red Sea.† This theory comports neither with the recorded itinerary of Exodus, nor with the surface of the country. But if "the land of Goshen lay along the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, on the east of the Delta," and if Rameses is represented by Abu-Keshēb, a little to the west of Lake Temsah,—where, according to Lepsius, has been found a monument of King Rameses II. as the divinity of the place,—then the traditional route from Rameses to the Red Sea by the far southern pass of the Wady Tuârik is clearly out of the question. But there is a decisive argument against this lower passage, which both Dr. Robinson and Mr. Stanley seem to have overlooked. It occurred to us with great force upon the ground. The route to the sea by Wady Tuârik would have been the worst possible in a *strategic* point of view, and therefore Moses, with his knowledge of the desert, would not have chosen it. There is no evidence that Moses was advised by Jehovah of an intended miracle, and so drew the people into a strait from which only a miracle could deliver them. He was commanded to lead the people out from Egypt, the ulterior design being to enter Palestine. The direct route to Palestine by the way of Gaza was impracticable, because of the hostile temper of the Philistines.‡ Therefore Moses was instructed to lead the people "by the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea." Of course he would aim for the head of the sea, above Suez, intending to pass round the neck into the desert. It is incredible that, aiming for the wilderness on the eastern side of the Gulf of Suez, he should have led the multitude through a narrow mountain defile that would bring them out upon the rocky western shore, ten miles from the head of the sea, and

* Letters from Egypt, &c., p. 438; see also Robinson's map.

† Vol. II. pp. 575, 597.

‡ Exodus xiii. 17.

where the channel is at least ten miles broad. The movement of the camp toward the sea-shore was a detour southward by express command of God;* and at Pihahiroth they were shut in by the wilderness and the sea, with the army of Pharaoh in the rear. This strategic consideration should settle the question in favor of a passage near the neck of the gulf. Upon the ground, the argument to the eye is conclusive. The several conjectural points of the passage are finely presented in Laborde's *Carte du Golfe de Suez*.† Laborde rejects the traditionary views of the lower passage, and also the view of Niebuhr, that the passage was made at the ford above Suez, and suggests nearly the course that Dr. Robinson has since indicated,—from Suez diagonally toward the Wells of Moses. It was with no ordinary emotion that we made this passage in a small open boat, with a strong "east wind."‡

* Exodus xiv. 2.

† *Commentaire Géographique sur l'Exode*.

‡ Since the preceding paragraph was written, we have received the Notes of Horatius Bonar, D.D., of Kelso, upon *The Desert of Sinai*, and find the strategic disadvantages of the movement of Israel toward Jebel Atakah urged as an argument against Dr. Robinson's theory that the passage was made near the neck of the Gulf of Suez. Dr. Bonar assumes that Moses had some premonition of the miracle, and on that ground defends this perilous movement of the camp. "In coming up to the sea at all, they were taking a circuit, — a circuit which, without any compensating advantage, threw them upon their enemies, and made their position most perilous. But in going south along the western margin of the sea for miles, as they did, they were doing more than taking a circuit. They were *deliberately* interposing the sea between them and Sinai, and voluntarily imposing upon themselves the necessity for crossing a gulf which they could easily have avoided, thereby making their extrication almost impossible. Had any general done so with his army, he would have been declared either mad or utterly ignorant of the country. But Moses knew the region well. He had more than once gone to Sinai, and was fully acquainted with the way. He could not but know that he was misleading Israel, unless he was conscious of Divine guidance all the way, — guidance which superseded and overruled his own judgment. His object was to reach the Sinaitic desert, yet he turns away from it, and throws a broad sea between himself and that desert! Only one thing can account for this, and acquit him of the greatest folly ever manifested by the leader of a people. That one thing is, that it was at the direct command of God that all this was done. God's purpose was to show his power both to Israel and to their enemies. For this end, he led them by a way which *required* the special and supernatural forthputting of that power. Either there was in this case a most enormous blunder, or a most signal miracle, — a miracle deliberately fore-intended, — a miracle which owes its magnitude to the

Mr. Stanley does better service to Biblical topography in his description of Mount Sinai and its surroundings. To Dr. Robinson belongs the credit of having brought to the knowledge of the Christian world a plain at the base of the Horeb cluster, — the Wady er-Râhah, lying north-northwest from es-Sûfsâfeh, — which meets all the requisitions of the narrative of the giving of the Law; a plain two miles long, and nearly half a mile in breadth, from the lower extremity of which the northern front of Sinai-Horeb, visible from all parts of the plain, rises almost perpendicularly to the height of about two thousand feet. A fine view of this plain and peak is given in Bartlett's "Forty Days in the Desert." Laborde has a good topographical plan of the Sinai group in his *Commentaire sur*

peculiarly circuitous march which Israel was commanded to make. Deny the miracle, and you make this circuitous route a piece of reckless folly, or pure ignorance, on the part of Moses." — *Notes of a Spring Journey from Cairo to Beersheba*, pp. 82–84.

Dr. Bonar seems to have taken a just view of the location of Rameses, and of the general route of the Israelites from that point to the Red Sea, except that he bends their course too far to the south. We have shown that the direct route would have led them around the neck of the Gulf of Suez; and it is evident that Moses, as a good strategist, was conducting them thither when he was commanded to turn southward toward the sea. This fact is conclusive against any of the lower routes conjectured for the passage. No doubt the miracle was "deliberately fore-intended" by God, who does not act at haphazard, or by sudden expedients to meet emergencies. But was Moses advised of the intended miracle before he came to Etham? That he was, Dr. Bonar assumes without evidence, or rather in face of evidence. It seems clear, from the narrative, that Moses was making for the head of the gulf, intending to go around it, when he was commanded to turn aside from his course, and to encamp by the sea (Exodus xiv. 1–12). Then it was revealed to him, on the day before the miracle, that Pharaoh was already in pursuit, and should be overthrown in the sea. This view of the case is rational, and corresponds alike with the narrative in Exodus, and with the natural features of the country; and this points to Suez as the place where the passage was made.

Dr. Bonar is severe upon Dr. Robinson for "paring down the miracle" by taking into account the ebb-tide. But the narrative in Exodus expressly recognizes natural agents, such as the "east wind," in producing the phenomenon of the divided waters; and as the use of natural agents does not set aside the supernatural direction and control of the same, neither does Dr. Robinson's recognition of those agents argue against his own belief in the supernatural. The foresight of the effect of wind and tide at that critical juncture, and a grand military movement founded upon it, point to a supernatural gift in the leader of that fugitive host. We believe that there was more than this in the case; but, in his zeal for the miracle, Dr. Bonar verges upon credulity; and we are not surprised to find him afterwards giving full credence to the legendary Sinai, in face of all the evidence for Sûfsâfeh as the peak, and er-Râhah as the plain.

l'Exode; a better one is given in Wilson's *Lands of the Bible*,* drawn after Russegger, by Johnston of Edinburgh; but better still is the colored map in Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*. We are surprised not to find in the maps accompanying the Biblical Researches a separate plan of this mountain cluster, such as is given in Kiepert's map of 1842.

It will surprise no one that the plain er-Râhah, now so conspicuous in the topography of Sinai, should have been overlooked by travellers previously to Dr. Robinson's visit in 1838, when it is remembered that tradition, which seeks the highest peaks and the deepest caverns, had fixed upon Jebel Musa as the Sinai of the Law, and that, till quite recently, the visitors to Sinai have been either pilgrims of devotion, or travellers who placed themselves implicitly under the guidance of the monks as to sacred localities. Since Dr. Robinson's visit in 1838, there has been a general acquiescence in his view by intelligent travellers. Dr. Wilson, who follows the tradition of the Wady Tuârik as the point of the Red Sea crossing, and contests Dr. Robinson's theory of the upper passage, most cordially concurs in his conclusion that er-Râhah was the place of encampment at Sinai. Lepsius, however, boldly transfers the whole scene to Mount Serbâl, which has in its favor neither name, tradition, nor topography. His arguments are, mainly, the prominent and striking character of the mountain, and the vicinity of Wady Feirân, which, he alleges, "in consequence of its incomparable fertility, and its inexhaustible rapid stream, must have been the most important and the most desirable central spot of the whole peninsula." † But Lepsius overlooks the fact, that Serbâl has no plain at or near its base adequate to the accommodation of such a multitude, and that the supply of the camp at Sinai is expressly stated to have been miraculous. He also exaggerates the fertility of Wady Feirân.

A very good reply to the arguments of Lepsius for Serbal is given *seriatim* by Graul, in the Appendix to his second volume. Graul is Director of the Evangelical Lutheran Mission

* Vol. I. p. 160.

† Letters from Egypt, &c., p. 304, Bohn's edition.

at Leipzig. He seems to be a devout, earnest, and intelligent man; but his volumes add little to our previous knowledge of Palestine, Egypt, and Arabia Petræa. He holds that the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea must have taken place somewhere in the immediate vicinity of Suez. In discussing the comparative claims of *Jebel Musa* and *es-Sūfsâfeh*, he characterizes the latter as the *Robinson'schen Ras es-Sufsafel* in opposition to the *klösterlichen Jebel Musa*, — a designation which indicates the exact controversy everywhere in Palestine, *Robinson* vs. *the Convent*. Graul's work contains a neat but not very accurate map of the region from Wady Ghüründel to Sinai.

Between the Wady *er-Râhah* and the Wady *Sebâyeh* at the foot of *Jebel Musa*, there is hardly room for a question. The latter is broken in every direction by ravines and spurs of the mountain; it is not large enough for such an encampment; and it does not command from every point a view of the summit of the mountain. But *er-Râhah* comes up flush to the base of the mountain, and in every other particular answers the conditions of the narrative. We have always regretted that Dr. Robinson, after his minute measurement of *er-Râhah*, did not go around to the southern base of the mountain *Jebel Musa*, and there inspect as thoroughly the Wady *Sebâyeh*. His omission to do this, like his failure to examine the tombs in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, has given occasion to some to cavil at his conclusions. Ill health prevented us from making a personal exploration of the Wady *Sebâyeh*; we only looked down upon it from the summit of *Jebel Musa*. But the contrast in the appearance of this and of *er-Râhah*, as seen from the top of *es-Sūfsâfeh*, is conclusive in favor of the latter as the place of the encampment. The jagged surface and narrow area of *Sebâyeh* forbade us to believe that three millions of people could have there encamped "in sight of the mount that might be touched." But from *es-Sūfsâfeh*, the plain of *er-Râhah* lay in all its amplitude directly at our feet, sweeping up to the very base of the mountain, so that one could drop a plummet upon it, and stretching out its smooth triangular surface broad enough for five millions to stand upon it, all in sight of the summit where we

stood. A few days before, we had crossed this plain in approaching Sinai by the awful defile of Nûkb Hâwy, had then measured the fitness of the plain for the encampment of Israël, and had felt the grandeur of the mountain that towers at its extremity. Now, on the summit of that mountain, we could not have a doubt. With uncovered head we read aloud "all the words of the law" that once were uttered there by "the voice that shook the earth."

By a thorough examination of Wady Sebâyeh, Mr. Stanley has supplemented the labors of Dr. Robinson, and strengthened his conclusion. We quote his graphic account of the two summits and their adjacent plains.

"And now for the question which every one asks on that consecrated spot. Is this 'the top of the mount' described in Exodus, or must we seek it elsewhere? The whole question turns on another question, whether there is a plain below it agreeing with the words of the narrative. Dr. Robinson, who has the merit of discovering first that magnificent approach which I have before described, on the other side of the mountain, declares not; but Laborde and others have so confidently maintained that there was a large and appropriate place for the encampment below this peak, that I was fully prepared to find it, and to believe in the old tradition. This impression is so instantly overthrown by the view of the Wâdy Seb'âyeh, as one looks down upon it from the precipice of Gebel Mousa, that it must be at once abandoned in favor of the view of the great approach before described, unless either the view of the plain of Er-Râheh was less imposing from above than it was from below, or the plain of Seb'âyeh more imposing from below than it was from above. The first thing to be done was, therefore, to gain the summit of the other end of the range called the Râs Sasâfah (Willow Head), overlooking the Er-Râheh from above. The whole party descended, and, after winding through the various basins and cliffs which make up the range, we reached the rocky point overlooking the approach we had come the preceding day. The effect on us, as on every one who has seen and described it, was instantaneous. It was like the seat on the top of Serbâl, but with the difference, that here was the deep, wide yellow plain swelling down to the very base of the cliffs; exactly answering to the plain on which the people 'removed and stood afar off' There is yet a higher mass of granite immediately above this point, which should be ascended, for the greater completeness of view which it affords. The plain below is then seen, extending not only between the ranges of Tlaha and Furei'â, but also

into the lateral valleys, which, on the northeast, unite it with the wide Wâdy of the Sheykh. This is important as showing how far the encampment may have been spread below, still within sight of the same summit. Behind extends the granite mass of the range of Gebel Mousa, cloven into deep gullies and basins, and ending in the traditional peak, crowned by the memorials of its double sanctity. The only point which now remained was to explore the Wâdy Seb'âyeh on the other side, and ascertain whether its appearance and its relation to Gebel Mousa from below was more suitable than it had seemed from above. This I did on the afternoon of the third day, and I came to the conclusion, that it could only be taken for the place if none other existed. It is rough, uneven, narrow. The only advantage which it has is, that the peak from a few points of view rises in a more commanding form than the Râs Sasâfeh. But the mountain never descends upon the plain. No! If we are to have a mountain without a wide amphitheatre at its base, let us have Serbâl; but if otherwise, I am sure that if the monks of Justinian had fixed the traditional scene on the Râs Sasâfeh, no one would for an instant have doubted that this only could be the spot. Considering the almost total absence of such conjunctions of plain and mountain in this region, it is a really important evidence to the truth of the narrative, that one such conjunction can be found, and that within the neighborhood of the traditional Sinai. Nor can I say that the degree of uncertainty, which must hang over it, materially diminished my enjoyment of it. In fact, it is a great safeguard for the real reverence due to the place, as the scene of the first great revelation of God to man. As it is, you may rest on your general convictions, and be thankful.” — pp. 75, 76.

This near approach to a positive opinion from the pen of Mr. Stanley upon a disputed point, is truly grateful. We had the pleasure of observing the effect of an actual survey of the Sinai district upon a company of Oxford graduates, two of whom could boast Mr. Stanley as their tutor. One day at dinner at the English hotel in Cairo, a very intelligent party seated opposite to us began to discuss the probable route of the Israelites to the Red Sea and Mount Sinai. Presently a speaker, turning suddenly to ourselves, inquired, “Who is this Dr. Robinson, a countryman of yours, who has made such an assault on our most sacred traditions?” In reply we gave an account of Dr. Robinson’s labors in Hebrew and Greek lexicography, and in connection with the theological semina-

ries at Andover and New York. This led to an exposition of the American mode of theological education, which was received with marked courtesy and attention. But the conclusion with our English friends was still, that, however learned Dr. Robinson might be, and however respected at home, he had forfeited the respect of every true Churchman by his wanton irreverence toward tradition, and especially the traditions of Suez, Sinai, and the Holy Sepulchre.

This party left Cairo for Sinai a little in advance of us, and on reaching the convent, we met them coming down from the summit of es-Sūfsâfeh. "Oh," cried they, with one voice, "what a man your Dr. Robinson is! He is quite right. We have visited every summit, and surveyed the whole ground, and every one must agree with him." We had the satisfaction of hearing them at Jerusalem renew this testimony to the accuracy of our countryman. Indeed, this iconoclast of tradition seemed to be their chief authority and guide,—a result honorable alike to him and to them.

Mr. Stanley entered Palestine from Petræa by way of Hebron. He followed, with little deviation, the usual route of intelligent travellers; his object being, not to search out and identify localities, but to enjoy sacred and historical associations, and to reproduce through the permanent physical features of the country the faded scenes of the past. His work, therefore, does not take the form of an itinerary, but is based upon natural and geographical divisions, such as the Maritime Plain, the Plain of Esdraelon, Ephraim, Galilee, and Lebanon.

Mr. Stanley rejects Tabor as the Mount of Transfiguration, and the summit of Olivet as the scene of the Ascension, upon grounds familiar to every scholar. He is evidently not a traditionist. With regard to the Ascension, we may here add, that Dr. Barclay claims to have identified the site of Bethphage,—overhanging the Wady Geddoom on the southern slope of the Mount of Olives,—and by means of this to have approximated the place of the Ascension.* We rode over the ground with him, and were much impressed by his ingenious and

* See Map of Jerusalem and Environs, by J. T. Barclay, M. D.

enthusiastic reasoning, but not wholly satisfied with his conclusion.

The most interesting, and perhaps the most valuable, portions of Mr. Stanley's book, are the chapter on Palestine,—which treats in general of the territory, its position, climate, cities, scenery, and geological features,—and the chapter on the Gospel History and Teaching, viewed in connection with the localities of Palestine. This strikingly exhibits “the reality of Christ's teaching, its homeliness and universality, and its union of human and divine.” No better idea of the book can be given than is conveyed in these words of the Preface:—

“ So to delineate the outward events of the Old and New Testament, as that they should come home with a new power to those who by long familiarity have almost ceased to regard them as historical truth at all, —so to bring out their inward spirit that the more complete realization of their outward form should not degrade, but exalt, the faith of which they are the vehicle,—this would indeed be an object worthy of all the labor which travellers and theologians have ever bestowed on the East.

“ The present work is but a humble contribution towards this great end. . . . Its object will be accomplished if it brings any one with fresh interest to the threshold of the Divine story, which has many approaches, as it has many mansions; which the more it is explored, the more it gives out; which, even when seen in close connection with the local associations from which its spirit holds most aloof, is still capable of imparting to them, and of receiving from them, a poetry, a life, an instruction, such as has fallen to the lot of no other history in the world.” — p. xxv.

“ Sinai and Palestine” and the “ Biblical Researches” supplement each the other. The former is a book that will be read, the latter a work that should be studied. Mr. Redfield of New York has published Mr. Stanley's book in a very attractive style,—a fac-simile of Mr. Murray's edition. We are sorry that we cannot speak in praise of the mechanical appearance of the “ Researches.” The paper is poor; the typography inferior; and the whole aspect of the work heavy and uninviting. When shall we see such a work published in the style of Milman's *Latin Christianity*? — But we suppose that “ would not pay.”

The extent of this article forbids a notice of the topographical and archæological researches, measurements, and plans of Dr. Tobler, which will hereafter be a leading authority in this department. The principal value of the works above noticed lies in the materials they furnish for an authentic geography of Palestine. Dr. Robinson's Researches, it is well understood, are but preliminary to the preparation of a Biblical Geography. We presume that these three volumes will be used as books of reference, to substantiate what the Geography will assume with regard to disputed localities. It is devoutly to be wished that the life and health of Dr. Robinson may be spared to complete this cherished object of years of toil.*

Meantime it is encouraging to notice that even maps for popular use exhibit traces of the recent investigations of scholars in Palestine. Colton's New Atlas, Chambers's Parlor Atlas, and Bagster's Chronological Atlas, all follow Robinson in the site of Cana, though they retain the old errors with respect to Emmaus and other places. Kiepert's new maps of course exhibit the latest and most accurate results of geographical science. His *Neuer Handatlas*, however, contains no separate map of Palestine. This country appears on a reduced scale in the map of *Klein-Asien, Syrien, und Armenien*. This Atlas, which is a beautiful specimen of improved cartography, will consist of ten *Lieferungen*, each containing four *Blättern*. Only three numbers, with twelve maps, have yet been published. Dr. Barclay's map of Jerusalem, made from personal surveys during a long residence in that city, is reliable and complete, and is worthy of a far better dress than that in which it appears.

Palestine is no longer a *terra incognita*; yet "there remains much land to be possessed." The names of Robinson, Smith, Thomson, Calhoun, Lynch, are an assurance that American scholarship and enterprise will not be wanting in the further exploration of the land. What is now most needed is a

* Keil, in his recent *Commentary on the Book of Joshua*, makes free use of the geographical data furnished by Ritter and Robinson. This Commentary is itself a contribution to Biblical geography in its relations to history.

thorough scientific survey of the whole country, with special reference to its agricultural capabilities, and an exploration of the trans-Jordanic regions for localities and remains, with a view also to commercial openings toward the East. While we write, there lie upon our table the Charter of the "Euphrates Valley Railway," and the project of the "European and Indian Junction Telegraph Company." The railway is to run *via* Seleucia and Aleppo; but a "Syrian Desert" Road has been projected, with branches from Damascus, *via* Sidon to Beirut, and *via* Jerusalem to Joppa! Possibly our learned friend Rabbi Raphall is right in his reading of Isaiah xliii. 19, as applicable to the proposed Syrian Desert Railroad: * "Behold I bring you something new, and even now shall it spring forth. Will you not recognize it? I will cause a road to be made through the wilderness, and rivers to flow through the desert." Possibly there *is* to be a restoration of the Jews to the soil of their fathers,— a point upon which we have been sceptical; and now that all nations are turning their eyes to Suez and Syria as the future routes of the China and India trade, and are there concentrating the resources of science and commerce for the world's highway, it may be that with this "fulness of the Gentiles" Israel shall be gathered to the land of their fathers.

* Essay read before the American Geographical Society, in New York.